...as the hated establishment.

Your 11/12/74 memo on theWG conspiracy trial testimony being a replay of the Ervin committee hearings. Necessarily yes. Little new. We agree that the essence of the facts brought out by the Ervin committee already had been leaked, and that this accomplished the leakers' purposes. What we would add about the Ervin committee is this: The leaks came out piecemeal, were reported in a confused and startled way and in such haste that the proper interrelationships among them were not discerned and pointed out as they should have been. Only people like yourself, and to a much less extent, we, who were a priori interested and heated through experience or predilection toward a questioning perspective had any chance of making the necessary connections of the fragmented parts into a coherent whole. The average person had neither incentive nor the means of doing anything of the kind. Most people were shocked and horrified, something that cannot be said of either of our two cases. We expected no better, in fact expected and still suspected much worse if anything. Not so with most people. They reacted at many of the revelations for which they had no preparation, made little if any of the automatic deductions we did, and in many many cases were dragged unwillingly along by the various stories and would have much preferred to forget the whole sordid business. Many did. Then came the Ervin hearings, which presented on national TV a coherent if watered down picture that was reasonably complete in the public mind and as a matter of fact much more complete than much of the public would have liked. That was followed somewhat later by the House Judiciary Committee hearings on impeachment which did a sort of update job on what the Ervin committee had produced, again on readily understandable TV, and whether we think either of these jobs was good, they combined to convince most of the yokels that Nixon had to go. Otherwise he would not have gone, and enough of the yokels would have risen to Saint Korff's emotional bait about the presidency to have made it possible for him to survive. As usual, the right thing happened for the wrong reasons, but it happened, however imcompletely and half-heartedly it was made to happen.

Add to your impressions of the conspiracy trial: We note that alone of the defendants, Haldeman is cheerful and brash. The rest glum. Indicates Haldeman still has some real or fancied control over Nixon. We'll see.

No dissent on Ehrlichman. We too noted his lawyer's puzzling [illegible] expected from a lawyer who served [illegible] we haven't been able to nail down; we [illegible] Nixon soon after [illegible] But no word of Bebe since then. [illegible] I'll believe it when I see [illegible] I am prepared to.

[illegible] about Hunt's testimony. I have read [illegible] saw nothing which was not carried by the [illegible] for anything.

[illegible] he used to work for them and I have [illegible] still does when the need arises. His attack on Holtzman [illegible], certainly. But is not his first lapse from what is [illegible] a stand one can identify with a normal, reasoning, liberal [illegible].

Only one clip enclosed, out of the past but still interesting.

Apologies for this choppy, garbled letter. As I said, we both are trying to catch up somewhat with things that have been neglected for years. The CIA [illegible]